

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

#### 1. Request for Continued Examination:

The applicant respectfully requests continued examination of the above-indicated application as per 37 CFR 1.114.

5

The amendments made to the claims in the above section are over the last entered claim amendment filed July 10, 2006.

#### 2. Rejection of claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

10

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatakenaka et al. (US 6,075,949, Hatakenaka hereinafter) in view of admitted prior art and further in view of Sabbagh et al. (US 6,814,510, Sabbagh hereinafter).

#### 15 Response:

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this claim rejection. Claim 1 now recites the limitations of "providing a printer manager for generating print data, the printer manager comprising a device-dependent converter for converting input data into device-dependent output data that is suitable for a first type of printer but not suitable for a second type of printer;" and "the lower layer of the operating system outputting the device-dependent print data to the printer, the printer being the first type of printer."

20

Therefore, the printer manager converts raw data into device-dependent print data that is suitable for only a specific type of printer, labeled as a first type of printer. The device-dependent print data is not suitable for a second type of printer, and is thus truly device-dependent print data. The lower layer of the operating system outputs the device-dependent print data to the printer, where the printer is the first type of printer.

25

30

On the other hand, Hatakenaka does not teach that the disclosed digital

camera 1 is capable of generating device-dependent print data that is suitable for only a first type of printer but not a second type of printer. In addition, Sabbagh also does not teach this limitation.

5 For these reasons, the applicant submits that the combination of Hatakenaka and Sabbagh fails to teach all of the limitations contained in the currently amended claim 1, and claim 1 should be patentable over the cited prior art.

10 Claim 4 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1 and 4 is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claims 2-3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

15 Claims 2-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatakenaka in view of admitted prior art and further in view of Sabbagh and further in view of Shiohara (US 6,618,553).

**Response:**

20 Claims 2, 3, and 6 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 2, 3, and 6 is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

25 Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatakenaka in view of admitted prior art and further in view of Sabbagh and further in view of Nakajima et al. (US 2002/0135687).

**Response:**

30 Claims 7-9 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 7-9 is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: 11.10.2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)